

BULLETIN OF THE INSTITUTE OF CLASSICAL STUDIES 54-2

INSTITUTE OF CLASSICAL STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

WILEY-BLACKWELL

OF TAPYROI AND TABLETS, STATES AND TRIBES: THE HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF PASTORALISM IN THE ACHAEMENID HEARTLAND IN GREEK AND ELAMITE SOURCES

WOUTER F. M. HENKELMAN

Introduction

In an aside to his narrative of Cyrus' rise to power, Herodotus lists the eleven Persian 'tribes' (γένεα) known to him.[1] Noting that some were farmers (ἀροτῆρες) and others nomadic pastoralists (νομάδες), he appears to be operating a sharp, Greek opposition between civilized cultivators and nomadic brigands. Taken literally, this neat distinction finds little support in ancient, or early-modern and contemporary evidence on tribal pastoralism in central and southwestern Iran. Pure nomadic pastoralism is rare in comparison with mixed varieties that include a certain amount of agriculture (semi- or agro-pastoralism) and may, in fact, be a relatively recent development. Modern tribal entities more often than not comprise both sedentary and (semi-)nomadic elements; tribal villages and towns belonging to the Qašqā'ī, Bakhtīārī, Khamseh, and other tribal federations primarily known as pastoralist are a common feature in southwestern Iran. Though one should beware of simply copy-pasting characteristics of contemporary tribal societies onto ancient contexts, it remains true that relevant sources on pre-Islamic Iran, however sparse, tend to corroborate the existence of transhumance and agro-pastoralism rather than full-fledged nomadism (*cf.* below). Taken less literally, however, Herodotus' statement indeed reads as a recognition of the importance of tribal structures in ancient Iran and, perhaps more salient, as an awareness of a typical Zagros mixture of sedentary and pastoralist elements.[2] As for the tribal divisions of Persian society, they are sometimes explicitly recognized in primary sources from within the Achaemenid empire, notably a smaller

[1] Hdt. 1.125. Compare Xen. *Cyr.* 1.2.5; Strabo 15.3.1.

[2] Herodotus and Persian society: P. Briant, 'La Perse avant l'empire (un état de question)', *IA* 19 (1984) 71-118, esp. 105-10, 'Hérodote et la société perse', Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 35 (Geneva 1990) 69-113, esp. 77-81, *From Cyrus to Alexander: a history of the Persian empire* (trans. Winona Lake 2002) 18-21, 878. Contemporary, partly sedentary, partly nomadic tribes in Iran: F. Barth, *Nomads of south Persia: the Basseri tribe of the Khamseh confederacy* (Oslo 1961), esp. 2-6, 116-21; M. Rowton, 'Urban autonomy in a nomadic environment', *JNES* 32 (1973) 201-15, 'Dimorphic structure and the tribal elite', in *al-Bāḥiṯ: Festschrift für Joseph Henninger*, Studia Instituti Anthropos 28 (St. Augustin 1976) 219-57, esp. 222-30. Origins of pure nomadic pastoralism: A. M. Khazanov, *Nomads and the outside world* (Cambridge 1983) esp. 97-106. For a recent critique of the Qašqā'ī (and Bakhtīārī) analogy see D. T. Potts, review of A. Alizadeh *et al., The origins of state organizations …* (Chicago 2006), *BO* 65 (2008) 195-206.

© 2011 Institute of Classical Studies University of London



Figure 1 Map of south-western Iran indicating places mentioned in the text

inscription at Naqš-e Rustam that identifies the Persian noble Gobryas as a 'Patischorian' (*cf.* below). The most important new evidence comes, however, from the institutional economy centred on Persepolis (Fārs, Iran) and its written output, which survives in the form of thousands of administrative clay tablets.

Found in 1933-34 in the north-eastern Fortification of the Persepolis terrace, the Persepolis Fortification archive (PFA) comprises at least 13,000 legible documents. It includes sealed und unsealed clay tablets written in the Elamite language and cuneiform script (*c.* 7,000 intact pieces and useful fragments), sealed tablets in Aramaic language and alphabetic script (*c.* 700), and anepigraphic tablets with one or several seal impressions (at least 5,000). Not only is the archive one of the largest corpora of Imperial Aramaic, of Achaemenid (glyptic) iconography, and of Elamite of any kind, it also provides a unique window on the heartland of the Achaemenid Empire and simultaneously illuminates many aspects of Persian culture and society in general. Among these are subjects as diverse as animal husbandry, the status of dependent and foreign workers, Persian identity, the royal road, taxation, the religious landscape, the movements of the court, and the households of royal women. The area under purview of the Persepolis administrators was vast – roughly the size of Switzerland –, the institution's human capital ran into the tens of thousands and its production reached staggering numbers. The PFA corpus therefore provides, all by itself, ample testimony to the unprecedented scale of agricultural and economic development initiated by the Achaemenid kings.[3]

[3] For recent surveys on the Fortification and Treasury archives, with bibliography, see Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander* (n. 2 above) 422-71, 938-47; P. Briant, W. F. M. Henkelman, and M. W. Stolper (eds.), *L'archive des Fortifications de Persépolis. État des questions et perspectives de recherches*, Persika 12 (Paris 2008); W. F. M. Henkelman, *The other gods who are: studies in Elamite-Iranian acculturation based on the Persepolis Fortification texts*, Achaemenid History 14 (Leiden 2008) 65-179, 'Persepolis Tablets', in *Encyclopaedia of*

© 2011 Institute of Classical Studies University of London

Dazzling as the amount of evidence at times is – certainly so in the eyes of its editors – it is very legitimate to ask what we do *not* have. This is, in the first place, necessary because the scope of the archive is limited to the intake, storage, and disbursement of locally-produced food commodities in the period of 509-493 BC. We do not (or hardly) hear about textile and craft production *per se*, the internal organization of the mobile court and the redistribution of the food commodities withdrawn for the famous Table of the King, or the actual agricultural and constructional work performed by work gangs from all parts of the empire. The simultaneous existence of other, now lost, archives is beyond doubt, as is the existence of both predecessor and successor archives. In fact, the much smaller Treasury archive, also from Persepolis but dated to 492-458 BC, provides a case in point: it shows that Elamite continued to be used to record the transactions within an institutional economy centred on Persepolis, but it also indicates the existence of parallel branches of the administration, in this case the central treasury from which payments in silver (rather than in kind) were issued. In addition, Pārsa, the Achaemenid heartland, appears to be but one region where Elamite was used for administrative documentation: similar archives are attested at Susa and even remote Kandahār by surviving snippets of evidence, and may be presumed in the case of Ecbatana and other places.[4]

Perhaps more worrisome than the question as to what we do not *have*, is the uncertainty as to what we do not *see*. PFA, like all ancient archives, presents a lopsided view of its world in that it reflects the perspective of administrators, not that of the many other actors involved, such as the many labourers, travellers stopping at the royal way-stations, specialized craftsmen, or landed nobility. Likewise, the administrators and scribes often leave us in the dark about the general outline of the operational system and the bureaucratic cycle, since these are taken for granted. Perhaps most elusive are the limits set to the institutional enterprise that I will refer to as the 'Persepolis economy'. The thousands of documents make it easy to gain the impression of an enclosed world, of a perfect, self-contained machinery. Though direct evidence is hard to come by, this image is certainly a false one: the institutional sphere was sharply delineated neither in geographical, nor in economic or societal terms. The royal domain is only partially visible in the archive, as are the estates of noble Persians, and the 'Houses' of the royal women, entities that were

Ancient History [forthcoming]; M. W. Stolper *et al.*, 'Persepolis Administrative Archives', *Encyclopaedia Iranica* [online version; forthcoming].

[4] Absent categories in PFA, lost archives: R. T. Hallock, 'The Persepolis Fortification archive', *Orientalia* 42 (1973) 320-23; Henkelman, *Other gods* (n. 3 above) 83-85, 124, 172-79, 'Animal sacrifice and "external" exchange in the Persepolis Fortification Tablets', in H. Baker and M. Jursa (eds.), *Approaching the Babylonian economy: proceedings of the START project symposium held in Vienna, 1-3 July 2004*, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 330 (Münster 2005) 137-65, esp. 147-49. Table of the king and absence of internal court administration: W. F. M. Henkelman, '"Consumed before the King." The Table of Darius, that of Irdabama and Irtaštuna, and that of his Satrap, Karkiš', in B. Jacobs and R. Rollinger (eds.), *Der Achämenidenhof*, Classica et Orientalia 2 (Wiesbaden 2010) 667-775, esp. 689-92. Archives at other locations: Henkelman, *Other gods* 78-79, 110-15, 'Consumed' (above) 696-97, 714 n. 174, 'From Gabae to Taoce: the geography of the central administrative province', in Briant, Henkelman, and Stolper (eds.), *L'archive des Fortifications de Persépolis* (n. 3 above) 303-16; P. Briant, 'Suse et Élam dans l'empire achéménide', in J. Perrot (ed.), *Le palais de Darius à Suse* (Paris 2010) 22-48. It may be that the explanation for the existence of the partial silver payments was the successful marketing of wool surpluses, the administration of which is entirely lost; *cf.* P. Briant, 'L'élévage ovin dans l'Empire achéménide', *JESHO* 22 (1979) 136-61, esp. 152-54 and M. Jursa, 'The remuneration of institutional labourers in an urban context in Babylonia in the first millennium BC', in *L'archive des Fortifications* 387-427, esp. 408-15.

© 2011 Institute of Classical Studies University of London

co-opted by the central administration, but not fully integrated. Likewise, base workers, who were sent to the heartland from all over the empire, may have carried their own silver to pay for their expenses, whereas others seem to have derived part of their income from plots of land of their own, of which, however, we hear hardly anything.[5]

Even animals were not confined to the Persepolis economy in the strict sense. Sheep and goats, which must have formed a major part of the institution's capital, were consigned to external herdsmen in a system known as share breeding. As in Achaemenid Babylonia, herds were entrusted to consignees under the obligation to return about 67 new-borns for each 100 fertile ewes and nanny goats, plus, presumably, one cheese per lactant animal as well as fixed amounts of wool and ghee. Recent analysis has brought to light that ducks, too, were entrusted to external parties (duck herds), again in analogy to contemporary Babylonia. Though the Fortification archive does not contain herding contracts – and thus remains silent about the legal and operational side of the system – it does provide useful glimpses by means of the annual inventories drawn up at the livestock stations, where the herdsmen presented the herds under their custody.[6] In addition, the herdsmen themselves are occasionally mentioned, as in PF-NN 2541:

> obv. col. I 1 Ampiška, 2 Sunnana, 3 Šati-kitin, 4 Hirmap, 5 Unsak, 6 Irdabanuš, 7 Šappa, 8 Kitindu, 9 Šilla, lower edge 10 Belitur, 11 Hupan-unbeš, 12 Nakamšap, rev. 13 Battikama, 14 Harkura, 15 Ašgitiš, 16 Išmimi – the same received (for) Umkur[?][…], 17 Šermimi 18 – the same received (for) Matanna, 19 Bagizza, 20 Daturšiš, 21 Nappitrana, 22 Akšira, upper edge 23 Umbatin[?], 24 Anakka, obv. col. II 25 Ratinaur[?], 26 Urdak, 27 Aklika, 28 Ludada, 29 Tiriya, 30 Šaušesu[?], 31 Saktiti; 32-33 total: 31 men, herdsmen, 33-34 under the responsibility of Battikama.[7]

[5] Estates and royal domain: Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander* (n. 3 above) 44-46, 460-71, 'L'économie royale entre privé et public', in R. Descat (ed.), *Approches de l'économie hellénistique*, Entretiens d'archéologie et d'histoire 7 (Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges 2006) 343-58; Henkelman, 'Consumed' (n. 4 above) 667-76. Foreign work teams with separate finance and/or organization: W. F. M. Henkelman and K. Kleber, 'Babylonian workers in the Persian heartland: palace building at Matannan during the reign of Cambyses', in C. Tuplin (ed.), *Persian responses: political and cultural interaction with(in) the Achaemenid empire* (Swansea 2007) 163-76; W. F. M. Henkelman and M. W. Stolper, 'Ethnic identity and ethnic labelling at Persepolis: the case of the Skudrians', in P. Briant and M. Chauveau (eds.), *Organisation des pouvoirs et contacts culturels dans les pays de l'empire achéménide*, Persika 14 (Paris 2009) 271-329, esp. 278-82. Views on the status of the *kurtaš* (labourers) diverge widely: conscript workers on corvée obligation, dependent labourers, or slaves in all but name. See, among others, A. Uchitel, 'Foreign workers in the Fortification archive', in L. de Meyer and H. Gasche (eds.), *Mésopotamie et Élam*, Mesopotamian History and Environment 1 (Ghent 1991) 127-35; G. G. Aperghis, 'War captives and economic exploitation: evidence from the Persepolis Fortification tablets', in J. Andreau, P. Briant, and R. Descat (eds.), *La guerre dans les économies antiques*, Entretiens d'archéologie et d'histoire 5 (Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges 2000) 127-44; Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander* 433-39, 505-07, 940-42; W. F. M. Henkelman [forthcoming], 'Elam', in H. Heinen (ed.), *Handwörterbuch der antiken Sklaverei* (Stuttgart).

[6] Consignment system (share breeding) and livestock stations: T. Kawase, 'Sheep and goats in the Persepolis royal economy', *Acta Sumerologica* 2 (1980) 37-51; W. F. M. Henkelman, C. E. Jones, and M. W. Stolper, 'Achaemenid Elamite administrative tablets, 2: the Qaṣr-i Abu Naṣr tablet', *ARTA* 2006.003; Henkelman, 'Animal sacrifice' (n. 4 above) 157-59; *cf.* G. van Driel, 'Neo-Babylonian sheep and goats', *Bulletin on Sumerian Agriculture* 7 (1993) 219-58. Ducks: Henkelman, 'Consumed' (n. 4 above) 736-37.

[7] Texts labelled with the siglum PF-NN were edited by the late R. T. Hallock in an unpublished manuscript; they are now collated and prepared for publication by the author. All the translations of Elamite texts cited in this paper are his. Line 20 of PF-NN 2541 also has, after a blank space, the number 499 or 799, which may represent

© 2011 Institute of Classical Studies University of London

What we have here is a view, however elusive, of ordinary individuals in the Persian heartland, who were, unlike the thousands of workers inside the Persepolis economy, at least nominally autonomous. Interestingly, the names of about half of these individuals seem to be Elamite, constituting a far larger proportion than in the archive in general, where only around ten percent of the onomasticon is Elamite. This circumstance deserves emphasis against the background of what has been called the ethnogenesis of the Persians, *i.e.* the hypothesis that Persian identity emerged from a long and dynamic process of acculturation and integration between Elamites and (Indo-)Iranians in the highlands of Fārs in the centuries preceding the emergence of the Achaemenid empire. One of the assumptions underlying this model is that an important part of Fārs was still inhabited by a culturally and linguistically Elamite population at the time of the arrival and formation of Indo-Iranian groups in the region, presumably in the period between 1500 and 1000 BC. Current archaeological investigations increasingly yield support for this view. Paralleling this, the Fortification archive has produced vital evidence on the genesis of Persian identity. To name just one case: eight gods sponsored by the Achaemenid state appear to have an Elamite background, against nine or ten with an (Indo-)Iranian background. In this context, the low overall percentage of Elamite names in the archive is plausibly to be understood as a sign that many people of Elamite extraction had shifted to the use of Iranian names.[8] Ethnogenesis, however, is rarely a linear and all-inclusive process resulting in a new cultural and ethnic homogeneity. History abounds in examples demonstrating that seemingly weighty cultural factors such as a common language do not need to be decisive requirements for a shared identity. Also, ethnogenesis is not a process in which all inhabitants of a region necessarily participate at the same time, at the same pace, and with the same outcome. Tribal groups may, for example, guard or enhance a perception of cultural distinctiveness, while at

the total of newborn animals re-entrusted to herdsmen after stock-taking, or given to them after subtraction of their contract obligation.

[8] Elamites in Fārs, the Neo-Elamite state in Khūzestān, and Persian ethnogenesis: P. de Miroschedji, 'La fin du royaume d'Anšan et de Suse et la naissance de l'Empire perse', *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 75 (1985) 265-306, 'La fin de l'Élam: essai d'analyse et d'interprétation', *IA* 25 (1990) 47-95; E. Carter, 'Bridging the gap between the Elamites and the Persians in southeastern Khuzistan', in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg, A. Kuhrt, and M. C. Root (eds.), *Achaemenid history*, vol. 8: *Continuity and change* (Leiden 1994) 65-95; W. F. M. Henkelman, 'Persians, Medes and Elamites: acculturation in the Neo-Elamite period', in G. B. Lanfranchi, M. Roaf, and R. Rollinger (eds.), *Continuity of Empire (?): Assyria, Media, Persia*, History of the Ancient Near East – Monographs 5 (Padova 2003) 181-231, *Other gods* (n. 3 above) 1-63, 'Cyrus the Persian and Darius the Elamite: a case of mistaken identity', in R. Rollinger, B. Truschnegg, and Rh. Bichler (eds.), *Herodot und das persische Weltreich*, *Classica et Orientalia* 3 (Wiesbaden) 577-634. Recent excavations and surveys: D. T. Potts, K. Roustaei, C. A. Petrie, and L. R. Weeks (eds.), *The Mamasani archaeological project, stage one: a report on the first two seasons of the ICAR – University of Sydney expedition to the Mamasani district, Fars province, Iran* (Tehran 2006); B. McCall, *The Mamasani archaeological survey: Epipalaeolithic to Elamite settlement patterns in the Mamasani district of the Zagros Mountains, Fars Province, Iran*, diss. University of Sydney (Sydney 2009); see also the overviews by R. Boucharlat, 'Iran', in P. Briant and R. Boucharlat (eds.), *L'archéologie de l'empire achéménide: nouvelles recherches*, Persika 6 (Paris 2005) 221-92, and W. F. M. Henkelman, 'The Achaemenid heartland: an archaeological-historical perspective', in D. T. Potts (ed.), *A companion to the archaeology of the ancient Near East* [in press]. Persepolis pantheon: Sh. Razmjou, 'The *lan* ceremony and other ritual ceremonies in the Achaemenid period: the Persepolis Fortification tablets', *Iran* 42 (2004) 103-17; Henkelman, *Other gods* (n. 3 above) *passim*, 'Parnakka's feast: *šip* in Parsa and Elam', in J. Álvarez-Mon and M. B. Garrison (eds.), *Elam and Persia* (Winona Lake 2011) 89-166. Persian identity and the cultural significance of Achaemenid Elamite as a contact language (*i.e.* Iranian-Elamite): Henkelman, 'Cyrus the Persian' (above).

© 2011 Institute of Classical Studies University of London

the same time being integrated in the larger network of a given region.[9] Since tribal organization appears to have been a factor of importance in Fārs in both the pre-Achaemenid and Achaemenid periods, we should not be too surprised that, among some groups, Elamite or Indo-Iranian traditions persisted in a more marked way than among the Persians populating the Persepolis economy. This could explain the significant number of Elamite names among the individuals in the text just quoted. The fact that they were hired as herdsmen may be indicative of a pastoralist background. We may then be dealing with a livestock-breeding group with a more pronounced Elamite signature (which is not the same as saying that they were 'Elamites' *tout court*).

(Agro-)Pastoralist tribes

Naturally, one should beware of drawing absolute conclusions from a text that is not only imperfectly understood, but also belongs to a rare document type and thus may not be representative of a general phenomenon. At the same time, there is confirmation for the assumption that the external herdsmen co-opted by the central administration could be members of pastoralist tribes. Apart from the fact that the existence of such tribes in Achaemenid Fārs is indicated by Graeco-Roman sources,[10] we also have Fortification texts pointing in this direction. Take for example PF 1829:

> obv. 01 Ušbaka spoke as follows: 02 '280 sheep/goats (of) the (pastoral) land 02-04 have been consigned to (lit. put on the head of) Tumarrimeya the Ākaufačiya, 04-05 including 120 taken from Tiriya 05-06 (and) 160 taken from Bakapikna, 07-08 as Darius [the King ordered/wished] ….' 09-10 15th? [year, xth da]y.

The *hakupiziya* (Old Iranian **ākōfačiya*-) of this text, if read correctly, is, literally, 'a dweller of the mountain-land'.[11] This topographical setting, the fact that the affiliation is explicitly mentioned, and the context of herd assigning may indicate that Tumarrimeya was a member of a predominantly pastoralist tribe. The name Ākaufačiya, moreover, is continued in Middle Persian Kōfēč and Arabic Qofṣ, which, in the early Islamic period, designated tribes in the mountainous Bašākerd area southeast of Bandar-e 'Abbās.[12]

[9] Ethnogenesis, while relatively well-studied for other regions and periods, has received little attention in the case of pre-Islamic Iran. For ancient societies, R. Wenskus, *Stammesbildung und Verfassung* (Köln – Graz 1961 [Germanic peoples]) remains the *locus classicus*. For more references see K. Strobel, 'Phryger – Lyder – Meder: Politische, ethnische und kulturelle Größen Zentral-Anatoliens bei Errichtung der achaimenidischen Herrschaft', in T. Bakır, H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg, G. Gürtekin, P. Briant, and W. Henkelman (eds.), *Achaemenid Anatolia: proceedings of the first international symposium on Anatolia in the Achaemenid period*, Publications de l'Institut Historique-Archéologique Néerlandais de Stanboul 92 (Leiden 2001) 43-55; R. Rollinger, 'Zur Lokalisation von Parsu(m)aš in der Fārs und zu einigen Fragen der frühen persischen Geschichte', *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 89 (1999) 115-39.

[10] Ouxioi, Elymaioi, and other Persian tribes in classical sources: P. Briant, *État et pasteurs au Moyen-Orient ancien* (Cambridge – Paris 1982) 57-112.

[11] For the emendation of HAL*ha-ku-zí-ia* to HAL*ha-ku<-pi>-zí-ia*, 'Akaufaciya', see R. Schmitt, 'Fragen der Anthroponomastik des achaimenidischen Vielvölkerstaates', *ZDMG* 128 (1978) 116-24, esp. 120. *Cf.* Henkelman and Stolper, 'Skudrians' (n. 5 above) 287, 300.

[12] See J. Markwart, *A catalogue of the provincial capitals of Ērānshahr* (Roma 1931) 74-76; H. H. Schaeder, 'Zwei altiranische Ortsnamen', *ZDMG* 96 (1942) 127-38, esp. 130-31; P. J. Junge, 'Ākaufačiya, ein Beitrag zu Länderkunde des alten Iran', *ZDMG* 98 (1944) 369-76, esp. 375-76; R. Schmitt, 'Ākaufačiyā', *Encyclopaedia Iranica* I (1984) 706; J. Tavernier, *Iranica in the Achaemenid Period (ca. 550-330 B.C.)*, Orientalia Lovaniensia

© 2011 Institute of Classical Studies University of London

Interestingly, the origin of the animals consigned to Tumarrimeya is indicated by the word *batin*, which may be a cognate of *batera*, 'herdsman', and denote 'pastoral land', hence an area physically and administratively beyond the agricultural zone under the direct control of the Persepolis authorities.[13]

Another category of texts from the Fortification archive concerns exchanges of staple commodities, such as barley, against livestock. Often the animals acquired are used for sacrifices, as in the following example (PF 0352):

> [01] 800 lts. of barley, [01-02] allocation from Mamannuš, [03-04] Ururu the priest received and delivered; [04-05] for it he received 8 sheep/goats, [06-07] and he has used those for the gods: [08] 2 for Adad, [09] 2 for a *kušukum*(-offering), [10] 2 for a *tikrakkaš*(-offering), [11] 2 for a reservoir(-offering). [12-4] Total: 8 yearling sheep/goats were being issued at the depot, [14] at Gisat. [15] 22nd year.

Though, in the past, scholars have explained such exchanges from an assumed taboo on animal sacrifices, a more mundane principle seems to be operative here: livestock represented the administration's core capital and administrators therefore tended to 'hoard' animals. If they could obtain the required sheep and goats for sacrifices from outside the institution's own herds, they readily took the opportunity to do so.[14]

Though the individuals supplying the animals in exchange procedures are never explicitly mentioned, they are likely to represent external parties (if not, the exchange would make little sense). Who these parties were is unclear. Greek sources suggest the existence of free smallholders, whereas the archive occasionally refers to owners of estates and sporadically hints at the circumstance that the institution's dependent labourers could have small plots of land at their disposal.[15] Of these groups, only the estate owners are likely to have had an economically significant surplus in livestock. An even better candidate, however, would be the (agro-)pastoralist population of certain parts of Fārs. Nearly all of the exchange texts of the above category appear to pertain to the so-called Fahliyān region, a series of valleys between the Rām Hormoz and Ardakān plains, defined by the course of the royal road. This region, the westernmost part of the territory under purview of the Persepolis administrators, comprises foothills bordering lowland Khūzestān and a series of the fertile

Analecta 158 (Leuven 2007) 24, 68. Compare the Ὠρεῖται of Arr. *Anab.* 6.21.3-22.3, *Ind.* 22.10-25.3; Diod. 17.105.1-3; *cf.* Plin. *NH* 6.95. For the name of Tumarrimeya (*Tavarēvaya-) see Tavernier, *Iranica* (above) 323.

[13] *batin* has hitherto been understood as 'district'; *cf.* R. T. Hallock, *Persepolis Fortification texts*, Oriental Institute Publications 92 (Chicago 1969) 676; the meaning of *batera* and (pl.) *batep* was established by G. G. Cameron, *Persepolis Treasury texts*, Oriental Institute Publications 65 (Chicago 1948) 163-64.

[14] For a demonstration and discussion of this principle (and notes to my interpretation of PF 0352), see Henkelman, 'Animal Sacrifice' (n. 4 above). On animal sacrifices see also W. F. M. Henkelman, 'An Elamite memorial: the *šumar* of Cambyses and Hystaspes', in W. Henkelman and A. Kuhrt (eds.), *A Persian perspective: essays in memory of Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg*, Achaemenid History 13 (Leiden 2003) 101-72, 'Parnakka's feast' (n. 8 above).

[15] Free smallholders (αὐτουργοὶ): Ael. *VH* 1.31-33, Xen. *Cyr*. 7.5.67; *cf.* Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander* (n. 2 above) 332-33, 441-42. Estates (*irmatam*): Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander* 444-45, 460-63, 943, 945. Seed giving to dependent workers (*kurtaš*), perhaps implying private plots of land: PF 0435, PF 0436, PF-NN 0694, PF-NN 2344:03; *cf.* Henkelman, 'Elam' (n. 5 above). The observation that dependent workers in the Achaemenid heartland received much lower wages than those in contemporary Babylonia (Jursa, 'Remuneration' [n. 4 above]) may also point to other sources of income, not documented in the Fortification archive.

© 2011 Institute of Classical Studies University of London

Zagros valleys of western Fārs. It partly coincides with the tribal areas inhabited by semi-autonomous (agro-)pastoralists such as the Elymaioi and the Ouxioi.[16]

Tribes and the Achaemenid State

We have some inkling of the bonds between the Ouxioi and the King of Kings by means of the (often distorted) descriptions based on the lost biographies of Alexander of Macedon. Strabo introduces the Ouxian country as follows: 'a rugged and sheer mountainous region … between the Susians and Persis, having narrow defiles that are hardly accessible and brigands (λῃστάς) for inhabitants, who exacted payments even from the kings themselves at the entrance from Susis into Persis'.[17] Alexander campaigned in the Ouxian territories on his march from Susa to Persepolis; incomplete accounts of this are given by Arrian, Q. Curtius, and Diodorus.[18] In Briant's analysis, Alexander first had to fight the 'Ouxioi of the Plain', led by Madates, a Persian governor. After a difficult siege of their fortified town, the Ouxioi surrendered, received Alexander's pardon and exemption from taxes on their fields. In what appears to be a second event, the Macedonian battled the 'Mountain Ouxioi', who blocked the road to Persepolis and who demanded that he would give them the same as the Persian kings used to give whenever they came to Fārs. Alexander took a narrow mountain track avoiding the blocked defiles, attacked the Ouxioi from the rear, massacred many, and, after offering these 'gifts', imposed an annual tribute of 100 horses, 500 transport animals, and 30,000 sheep and goats on the survivors. 'For the Ouxioi', Arrian states, 'had no money nor land that could be cultivated, but most of them were herdsmen (νομεῖς)'.[19]

The case of the Ouxioi illustrates the principle alluded to previously: that tribal formations in southwestern Iran often comprised both sedentary farmers and semi-nomadic pastoralists. The Ouxioi of the plain had a fortified town, are described as farmers and inhabitants of a fertile, well-watered region; they were governed by a Persian official and reported to the satrap of Persis. The Ouxians of the mountains lived in small villages (κῶμαι) at higher altitudes and are described by Arrian as pastoralist, an observation underlined by the kind of tribute imposed on them by Alexander; they appear to have been (semi-)autonomous. Despite these differences, the two groups of Ouxioi not only shared a common name, but also lived in the same area; it seems only logical to assume that they had a shared tribal identity (be it historical or constructed). In fact, the preserved perspective may essentially be that of the Achaemenid authorities in the sense

[16] For a demonstration of the geographical background of the exchange texts see Henkelman, 'Animal sacrifice' (n. 4 above) 160-61. Fahliyān region: Henkelman, 'From Gabae to Taoce' (n. 4 above), *Other gods* (n. 3 above) 119 and index s.v.; D. T. Potts, 'The Persepolis Fortification texts and the Royal Road: another look at the Fahliyan area', in Briant, Henkelman, and Stolper (eds.), *L'archive des Fortifications* (n. 3 above) 275-301.

[17] Strabo 15.3.4 [728C], trans. adapted from H. L. Jones (Loeb); *cf.* 15.3.6 [729C].

[18] Arr. *Anab*. 3.17.1-6; Q. Curt. 5.3.1-16; Diod. 17.67.1-5.

[19] Arr. *Anab*. 3.17.6. See P. Briant, '"Brigandage," dissidence et conquête en Asie achéménide et hellénistique', *DHA* 2 (1976) 163-258, esp. 214-21. A. B. Bosworth, *A historical commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander*, vol. 1 (Oxford 1980) 321-24, also assumes two separate events. J. E. Atkinson, *A commentary on Q. Curtius Rufus'* Historiae Alexandri Magni, *books 5 to 7.2* (Amsterdam 1994) 69-83, has a different reading of the Ouxian campaigns, but again assumes two different events.

© 2011 Institute of Classical Studies University of London

that it primarily reflects an administrative division, presumably resulting from the establishment of direct Achaemenid rule over part of the Ouxian country.[20]

The location of the Ouxian country remains debated. An area that has long been considered to fit the extant descriptions is the fertile and well-watered Fahliyān valley (or Dašt-e Rostam-e Yek) and the surrounding mountains. If correct, it would be tempting to identify the fortified town of the Ouxioi, which Alexander reportedly left intact, with Tol-e Spīd, an imposing and strategic site situated not far from the western exit of the valley and continuously occupied, throughout the Achaemenid and post-Achaemenid periods. Yet, arguments have also been raised for a much more western location of the Ouxian country, directly east of Šūštar.[21]

Be that as it may, the 'Mountain Ouxioi' clearly did not live along the main road from Susa to Persepolis, implying that the Persian kings, as well as Alexander, had to make a detour to reach their country. This, in turn, signifies a deliberate act on behalf of the Achaemenids rather than a forced payment to nomadic brigands. As Briant proposes, one could read the classical sources as echoes of what actually was an annual ceremony of gift-giving that sealed the loyalty of the recipients (the Ouxian chiefs) to the giver, the King of Kings. The advantage of such a procedure would be that the Ouxioi were made part of the fabric of the Achaemenid empire without costly and protracted military effort. Unlike the brute force deployed by Alexander, the Persian approach yielded a sustainable agreement, benefiting both parties. Not only was the area pacified, but, like other semi-autonomous tribes, the Ouxioi also seem to have provided contingents for the royal armies.[22]

In addition, the annual ceremony of giving (or exchanging) gifts may well have inaugurated and regulated common exchanges between two economic zones. The tribute imposed by Alexander on the Mountain Ouxioi (100 horses, 500 pack animals and 30,000 sheep) not only shows how extensive their livestock capital was, but may in fact have been based on the volume of such earlier exchanges.[23] At any rate, as tribesmen specializing in sheep-based pastoralism, the Mountain Ouxioi would have been eager to trade their surplus in animals. Though Arrian is clearly overstating the case by claiming that they did not have *any* arable land, it is not unlikely that they obtained some additional staple commodities (grain, fruit) from the Ouxioi of the Plain and other parties. They would, however, also be

[20] *Cf.* Briant, 'Brigandage' (n. 19 above) 180-81, 194; also *État et pasteurs* (n. 10 above) 67-81. Ouxian farmers: Diod. 17.67.3 (*cf.* 19.21.3); Curt. 5.3.15; Ouxian pastoralists: Arr. *Anab*. 3.17.3, 6.

[21] Curtius (5.3.5-12) describes the Ouxian settlement as a fortified *urbs* with an *arx* that was apparently set on a mountain slope. Ouxians in the Fahliyān valley: Sir A. Stein, *Old routes of western Īrān* (London 1940) 40-43; J. Hansman, 'Elamites, Achaemenians and Anshan', *Iran* 10 (1972) 102-24, esp. 117-19; Briant, 'Brigandage' (n. 19 above) 220; J.-P. Digard, 'Montagnards et nomades d'Iran: des "brigands" des Grecs aux "sauvages" d'aujourd'hui', *DHA* 2 (1976) 263-73, esp. 266-67. Excavations at Tol-e Spīd: Potts *et al*., *Mamasani* (n. 8 above) esp. 89-134; A. Asgari Chaverdi *et al*., 'Archaeological evidence for Achaemenid settlement within the Mamasani valleys, western Fars, Iran', in J. Curtis and St. J. Simpson (eds.), *The World of Achaemenid Persia: history, art and society in Iran and the ancient Near East* (London 2010) 287-97, esp. 289-91. Ouxians east of Šūštar: H. Speck, 'Alexander at the Persian Gates: a study in historiography and topography', *AJAH* ns. 1 (2002) 7-234, esp. 157-58 (*cf.* index s.v. Uxiana).

[22] Arr. *Anab.* 3.8.5, 11.5; *cf.* Briant, 'Brigandage' (n. 19 above) 194, *From Cyrus to Alexander* (n. 2 above) 729, 731, 766-77; Digard, 'Montagnards' (n. 21 above) 268-69.

[23] So Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander* (n. 2 above) 732. See also 'Brigandage' (n. 19 above) 229 n. 44 on the nature of the pack animals and Digard, 'Montagnards' (n. 21 above) 265, on the size of the imposed tribute.

© 2011 Institute of Classical Studies University of London

interested in obtaining products of which their region produced little or nothing – such as silver and luxury items – as royal gifts and through other exchanges.[24]

The Ouxioi of the Plain are said by Arrian to have fallen under the purview of the administration of Persis at the time of Darius III. The Fortification archive, from the time of Darius I, confirms this image: all the valley systems down to lowland Khūzestān fell under the purview of the institution centred on Persepolis. The exchanges of staple goods for sacrificial animals that are notably attested in the institution's westernmost sector (the 'Fahliyān region'), could in fact pertain to areas such as the Ouxian country. What we are seeing here could be an institutionalized form of traditional exchanges between settled farmers and pastoralists within the same tribe-internal dimorphic system. Though the exchanges recorded in the archive are of a modest scale and reflect *ad hoc* needs and opportunities, I would venture the suggestion that their background was the annual renewal of an agreement between the Achaemenid king and the semi-autonomous Zagros tribes. An interesting detail in this regard is that the exchange ratio was fixed: 100 lt. barley or 30 lt. wine against one sheep/goat. This seems to reflect the non-commercial and regulated nature of the exchanges, which in turn agrees well with the hypothesis that transactions between the two socio-economic zones took place under the aegis of annual royal gift-giving. In such situations, exchanges tend to be ruled, at least nominally, by the laws of the gift, not by those of commerce.

Finally, the Ouxioi are also of interest from the perspective of the ethnogenesis of the Persians. They lived in the border zone of eastern Khūzestān and western Fārs, an area where a number of important Elamite centres were situated, such as the city of Hidali, which had been a crucially important strategic centre of the Neo-Elamite state (*c*. 750-*c*. 540/520 BC). In the Achaemenid period, Elamite as spoken language still had a relatively strong presence in this same area. At the same time, the circumstance that the region was previously within the economic (if not political) sphere of the Susa-based Neo-Elamite state, but later was controlled from Persepolis, may indicate a progressive westwards Persianization.[25] Given these factors, we may revisit the old etymology that explains

[24] See Briant, 'Brigandage' (n. 19) 189-94, *État et pasteurs* (n. 10 above) esp. 81-94, *From Cyrus to Alexander* (n. 2 above) 469, 726-33, 1022. Elsewhere, I have attempted to explain the late Neo-Elamite silver hoard known as the Kalmākarra treasure (southern Lorestān) as the accumulated wealth of an (agro-)pastoralist tribe that profited from the wool trade ('Persians, Medes' [n. 8 above] 214-27; *Other gods* [n. 3 above] 28-30).

[25] Control from Persis: Arr. *Anab*. 3.17.1. The assignment of the region to the satrap of Susa by Alexander (Curt. 5.3.15-16) is quite intriguing when seen from the ealier administrative shift. Another relevant aspect is the apparent connection between the royal woman Irdabama, perhaps Darius's mother, and the westernmost sector of the Persepolis economy. Irdabama had an estate in Šullaggi in the Zagros foothills of eastern Khūzestān (and perhaps other interests in the same region). There is a possibility that Irdabama herself came from a local Elamite dynasty of rulers of Šullaggi; if so, the royal woman with her Iranian name and exalted position at the court would be a striking example of the intricacies of the Persian ethnogenesis (*cf.* Henkelman, 'Consumed' [n. 4 above] 693-97 and 'Cyrus the Persian' [n. 8 above]). Furthermore, Irdabama's connection with the said region could be relevant for the case of Sisygambis, mother of Darius III. Scholars such as Briant ('Brigandage' [n. 19 above] 216) and Bosworth (*Commentary* [n. 19 above] 323-24) have tried to explain why Sisygambis pleaded for the life of Madates, the governor of the Ouxioi of the plain, and why Alexander not only granted her this, but also exempted the Ouxioi from paying tribute (Curt. 5.3.11-15; *cf.* Arr. *Anab*. 3.17.6). I wonder**,** however**,** whether the family relationship between Madates and Sisygambis suffices to explain Alexander's unparalleled fiscal magnanimity. Did Sisygambis, like Irdabama, have economic interests (*i.e.* estates or entire villages) in the Ouxian country (sc. in the westernmost sector of the Persepolis economy)?

© 2011 Institute of Classical Studies University of London

Greek Οὔξιοι as a cognate of Old Persian *Ū(v)ja-*, 'Elam', and *Ūjiya-*, 'Elamite'. That the Persians had their own term for Elam and the Elamites and did not use the indigenous name (*haltamti-*) may seem puzzling, but becomes explicable if one assumes that the first Elamite-speaking groups they encountered lived in the Zagros valleys and called themselves and/or their territory /uča/ or /uw(a)ča/.[26]

Persian society

One thing that one should certainly *not* conclude from the above is that the Ouxioi constituted Elamite outsiders, partly subjugated by Persian masters. As indicted above, ethnicity and identity are rather fluid concepts that, especially in the case of tribal groups, may change frequently and rapidly. The Ouxioi of the pre-Achaemenid period, if they indeed existed, surely were quite different from the groups Alexander encountered. Conversely, the meaning of 'Persian' was hardly a constant factor either: the earliest Persians known from Akkadian and Elamite sources were clearly different from those of the Achaemenid period.[27] In this context it is, of course, highly relevant that the Achaemenid Persians themselves still preserved their tribal organization. Here, again, the

[26] I have proposed a similar explanation for the enigmatic 'Skudrians' in Achaemenid texts (Henkelman and Stolper, 'Skudrians' [n. 5 above] 292-99). Οὔξιοι and *Ū(v)ja-*: H. C. Rawlinson, 'The Persian cuneiform inscription at Behistun, decyphered and translated, with a memoir on Persian cuneiform inscriptions in general and on that of Behistun in particular', *JRAS* 10 (1847) i-lxxi, 1-349, esp. 79-80; Th. Nöldeke, 'Griechische Namen Susiana's', *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen* 8 (1874) 173-97, esp. 184-87; F. Justi, 'Geschichte Irans von den ältesten Zeiten bis zum Ausgang der Sāsāniden', in W. Geiger and E. Kuhn (eds.), *Grundriß der iranischen Philologie* 2 (Strassburg 1896-1904) 395-550, esp. 417-18; W. Hinz, *Das Reich Elam* (Stuttgart 1964) 19. Οὔξιοι and Οὐζία (Ptol. *Geogr*. 6.4.7 [perhaps also Οὐζαῖοι, attested in a single manuscript for regular Σουζαῖοι in 6.4.3]) are likely to be variant renderings of the same Iranian/Elamite name. The origin of *Ū(v)ja*, and thus of Οὔξιοι, is complicated by the purported connection with the name of the city of Šušan as defended by O. Szemerényi, 'Iranica II', *Die Sprache* 12 (1966) 190-226, esp. 190-94 with n. 19. According to this thesis, speakers of Old Iranian first knew of the city of Susa and based their name for the surrounding land (Elam) on it (assuming *Šušan* > *^{h}Ūja-*). One problem in this reconstruction is the particular usage of Οὔξιοι for a limited group in eastern Khūzestān, but the etymology itself also seems problematic (the derivation of later 'Khūzestān' from the assumed form *^{h}ūja-* is yet another matter, which need not concern us here); it seems, therefore, preferable to take *Šušan* and the form underlying *Ū(v)ja-*/Οὔξιοι as distinct. If Elamite in origin, *Ū(v)ja-* could reflect /uča/. Based on a reversal of the rule that Old Iranian /j/ was usually expressed in Elamite writing with signs from the *ṣ/z* series, *i.e.* the same signs that, in *Elamite words*, express /č/ or /s'/ (J. Tavernier, 'On the sounds rendered by the *s-*, *š-* and *ṣ/z*-series in Elamite', in L. Kogan *et al.* (eds.), *Proceedings of the 53^{e} Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*, vol. 1: *language in the ancient Near East*, Babel und Bibel 4 [Moscow 2010] 1058-78), one may suspect that the *j* in *Ūja* renders Elamite /č/ or /s'/ (there is no proof of a phoneme /j/ in Elamite). Greek Οὔξιοι makes /č/ more like than /s'/ (pers. comm. J. Tavernier 21/6/2010). The spelling variation between u-v-j-a and u-j-a in Old Persian writing may be no more than a matter of orthography (*cf.* R. Schmitt, 'Altpersisch', in R. Schmitt (ed.), *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum* [Wiesbaden 1989] 56-85, esp. 65). On the other hand, the personal name *ú-ma-zi-ia/-iá* in two Neo-Babylonian texts (on which see R. Zadok, 'Iranian Notes', *Notes assyriologiques brèves et utilitaires* 2002/78), may be relevant and could reflect an older form **umaza-* /uwača/. Regular vowel elision in the second syllable would render this **umza-* /uwča/, which in turn could have developed into **uza-* /uča/. Assuming **umza-* /uwča/ > **uza-* /uča/ would yield an alternative solution for the variation between *Ūvja-* and *Ūja-*. The matter may, however, be more complicated as Procopius in the 6th century AD still knew of a region in Persis called Οὐαζαίνη (*Goth*. 4.10.9), which would point to the continuation of the older form **umaza-* /uwača/.

[27] Development of Persian identity: Henkelman, 'Cyrus the Persian' (n. 8 above); *cf. Other gods* (n. 3 above) 343-50.

© 2011 Institute of Classical Studies University of London

Fortification archive offers additional evidence, suggesting that the heartland administration recognized the status of individual tribes and their leaders. Members of certain tribes, such as the Maraphioi (*marappiyap*) and Kossaioi (*kušiyap*), are explicitly named, which already implies a recognition of their tribal identity.[28] Though there are few such texts, the language used reveals something of Persian social structures, as is the case in PF-NN 1581, mentioning a *batišmariš*, 'Patischorian':

> [01-02] 3,000 lts. of wine, [02-05] a Patischorian workman named Mamba[…]ra, [05-06] for whom Kambarma is responsible, [6-7] he received (it). [08-10] He transported (the wine) from Akkuban to Appištapdan. [11-13] Seventh month, 21st year. [13-16] Nasukka and Šarizza received (the wine at Appištapdan).

The Kambarma of this text can be identified with the famous Gaubaruva, mentioned in the Bīsotūn inscription as one of the six helpers who backed Darius' bid for power, known to Herodotus as Gobryas, in-law of the king, and attested in the tablets as recipient of high amounts of commodities and as holder of a magnificent stamp seal.[29] In another royal inscription he is called a *pātišuvariš*, 'Patischorian', which has led to the attractive suggestion that Gobryas was leader of the important Persian clan of the Παρ(ε)ισχορεῖς.[30] This seems to be confirmed by the above text. Not only does Kambarma/Gobryas act as the person responsible for a Patischorian, but the latter individual is also introduced as a *martam*, 'workman' (Old Persian **varda*-). This is a rare term, apparently used only for individuals directly attached to certain high-ranking Persians.[31] In other words, Kambarma/Gobryas is likely to be responsible for 'Mamba[…]ra the Patischorian workman' precisely because he is leader of the Patischorian clan. Such groups were not normally involved in the administrative system documented by the Fortification archive, but when they were, it appears that not only tribal affiliations, but also tribal hierarchies are recognized. In the above text, the exceptional context may be understood by the reference to Appištapdan, which was very much a royal place, site of a 'paradise' (plantation) and locus of royal banquets.[32] Since there are other texts suggesting that high-

[28] See references in Henkelman and Stolper, 'Skudrians' (n. 5 above) 287 n. 43.

[29] Bīsotūn IV.84, V.1-13; Hdt. 7.2; PFa texts: PF 0688, NN 0210, PF-NN 1133, PF-NN 2533, Fort. 01017. PF-NN 1581, quoted above, is published in Henkelman and Stolper, 'Skudrians' (n. 5 above) 284-87. Seal of Gobryas (PF 0857s): M. C. Root, 'From the heart: powerful Persianisms in the art of the western empire,' in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg and A. Kuhrt (eds.), *Achaemenid History VI: Asia Minor and Egypt, old cultures in a new empire* (Leiden 1991) 1-29, esp. 19-21, and J. E. Gates, 'The ethnicity name game: what lies behind "Graeco-Persian"?', *Ars Orientalis* 32 (2002) 105-32, esp. 108, 126-27.

[30] The royal inscription is a caption on the façade of the tomb of Darius I at Naqš-e Rustam (DNc); see R. Schmitt, *The Old Persian Inscriptions of Naqsh-i Rustam and Persepolis*, Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum I.1.2 (London 2000) 45, and Henkelman, 'Elamite memorial' (n. 14 above) 119-20. Παρ(ε)ισχορεῖς: Strabo 15.3.1. Gobryas as leader of the Patischorians: Briant, 'Société perse' (n. 2 above) 79, 83-84. Compare the case of Orxines, satrap (as well as tribal leader) of the Pasargadae according to Q. Curt. 10.1.22-23. A place named Battišmarran (^{AŠ}*bat-ti-iš-mar-ra-an*) occurs three times in an unpublished text (Fort. 1904-001); it may be a Patischorian tribal town (*cf.* the town, *urbs*, of the Ouxioi).

[31] On *martam* (**varda*-) see W. Hinz, *Neue Wege im Altpersischen*, Göttinger Orientforschungen 3.1 (Wiesbaden 1973) 85-86. See discussion in Henkelman, 'Consumed' (n. 4 above) 710-11.

[32] Henkelman, *Other gods* (n. 3 above) 439-40, 'Parnakka's feast' (n. 8 above) 109-10, 145-46, 'Consumed' (n. 4 above) 715, 727.

© 2011 Institute of Classical Studies University of London

ranking Persians had the (ceremonial) obligation of providing and transporting wine and other requirements for royal banquets, one could speculate that the above document refers to such an episode. The exceptional circumstance would then be that Gobryas for some unknown (logistic) reason did not provide the wine directly from the resources of his clan, but that his representative received it on credit from the administration.[33]

A last example is presented below (Figure 2). It is a text, published here for the first time, that once again mentions a tribal name in a special context:

PF-NN 2458 (Box: 1521)
Seal: PFS 2323 (reverse, left edge)

Obverse
(01) [x] QA.BAR *ha-um-ra*
(02) [HAL]*da-ap-pu-ra-*⌜*ap*⌝
(03) ⌜*ka*$_4$⌝*-ma-ka*$_4$ *du-*⌜*ma*$^!$⌝*-*
(04) ⌜*iš*⌝*-da* ⌜*kur-mán*⌝ HAL ⌜*ba*⌝*-*
(05) ⌜*ka*$_4$⌝*-da-ud-da* ⌜*ap*$^?$⌝*-*
(06) ⌜*pi*$^?$⌝*-ia-da-kur-ra-*
Lower edge
(07) *na be-ul* 27*-me-na*
Reverse uninscribed

[1] [x] lt. of *hamaram* (a cereal product) [2-4] Tapyroi received (as) bonus, [4-6] allocation from Bakadadda the *appiyadakurra*. Year 27.[34]

The exceptional nature of this document is immediately clear from the seal, PFS 2323, impressed on its reverse and left edge (Figure 2 and below, Garrison Figures 1 and 2). The seal image, showing a boar hunt, is a masterpiece of glyptic art, and as such suggestive of the elevated status of its holder.[35] That only one seal, possibly that of Bakadadda, is used ('single seal protocol'), indicates that an overarching jurisdiction is involved; ordinary receipts always required sealing from both supplier and recipient or agent ('counter sealing').[36] At the same time, the seal is thus far attested only on this tablet, suggesting that the seal holder was not normally involved in the Persepolis economy. The contents of the document are equally remarkable. Not only does the text refer to bonus rations to *dappurap*, but the allocation is also made by an individual with a special designation or title, a very unusual feature in such texts. The word, which I tentatively read as *ap-pi-ia-da-kur-ra*, could be interpreted as 'performer of water-worship', thus describing an expert

[33] Compare the case of the satrap Karkiš, whose workman (**varda*-) similarly transported wine for the royal table: Henkelman, 'Consumed' (n. 4 above) 709-12.

[34] Year 27 of Darius's reign corresponds to 495-94 BC. On *hamaram* (Old Persian **hvara*-) see Tavernier, *Iranica* (n. 12 above) 456.

[35] My colleague Mark Garrison kindly prepared a brief description of the seal image, published on pp. 17-20 of this volume.

[36] Sealing protocols: M. B. Garrison and M. C. Root, *Seals on the Persepolis Fortification tablets*, vol. 1: *Images of heroic encounter*, Oriental Institute Publications 117 (Chicago 2001) 11-13 and *passim*; Henkelman, *Other gods* (n. 3 above) 129-34.

© 2011 Institute of Classical Studies University of London



Figure 2 Tablet granting a bonus to the Tapyroi, 495-4 BC: PF-NN 2458; the seal is PFS 2323 (reverse, left edge)

© 2011 Institute of Classical Studies University of London

of religious rites at river banks as known from Fortification texts and classical sources.[37] An alternative reading, requiring emendation, would be *ap-pi-ia-da<-na>-kur-ra*, which could be interpreted as **āpiyadānakara-*, 'reservoir-builder' (or, figuratively, 'supply-maker').[38] In neither of these interpretations does Bakadadda's designation seem directly relevant to the transaction recorded; it may rather be a title indicating his rank or status.[39]

As for the *dappurap*, these must be the Tapyroi, an Iranian tribe mentioned in the Greco-Roman sources. Ctesias and Eratosthenes locate the Tapyroi in the Caspian region, in the mountainous country south of the Alborz range (*cf.* the Tabarestān of later times). Ctesias also knows about their habit of rubbing their skin with wine.[40] Furthermore, we hear about their notable dress and marital customs,[41] that they were part of the cavalry deployed by Darius III in the battle of Gaugamela,[42] and that they were subdued by Alexander.[43] They emerge as an equid-breeding pastoralist tribe living in a region that was indeed renowned for its horses. One source does not fit the picture, however. Arrian describes Peucestas' arrival at Babylon, in 323 BC, with an army gathered in the Persian heartland: '[Peucestas] had also brought a substantial number of Kossaioi and Tapyroi, for those same tribes, it was reported, were the most warlike of those living on the borders of Persis'.[44] One might have doubted the correctness of this testimony, since it locates (a group of) Tapyroi in Persis (Fārs), rather than in the Caspian region. Such doubts disappear with the text presented above, which shows the presence of *dappurap* in the Persian heartland in 495-94 BC.

In itself, the duplication of a tribal name is not unusual. The Mardoi and Kyrtioi too, for example, are said to live both in Fārs and in the Caspian region.[45] In the Old Babylonian period (early second millennium BC), there is a Yamutbal tribal area in northern Mesopotamia (Jebel Sinğār area), and another one, Emutbala/Yamutbal, in the far south (around Larsa). In the mid-20th century AD, tribal groups calling themselves Bāṣerī lived both in the area around Šīrāz and east of Tehrān. Such duplications may result from migrations and occasionally from deportations, but may equally be explained as a copying of names in the formation of new tribal identities or the construction of shared ancestry.[46]

[37] The second part of the compound, *-kurra*, reflects Old Persian *-kara*, 'maker', showing that the word is a loan. As for *ap-pi-ia-da*, it could transcribe **āpi-yada-*, 'water-worship', hence 'performer of water-worship'. Sacrifices on river banks: Hdt. 1.131; Strabo 15.3.13-14; *cf.* A. de Jong, *Traditions of the Magi: Zoroastrianism in Greek & Latin texts* (Leiden 1997) 101, 138-39; Henkelman, *Other gods* (n. 3 above) 224, 377-80, 539-41.

[38] The form would be comparable to *ap-pi-da-na-bar-ra* (**āpidānabara-*), 'reservoir-master' (Tavernier, *Iranica* [n. 12 above] 415).

[39] On such titles see Henkelman, 'Elamite memorial' (n. 14 above) 120-29.

[40] Ctes. F45 and F1b §2.3 Lenfant; Strabo 11.8.8 [514C]; Polyb. 5.44.

[41] Strabo 11.9.1 [515C], 11.8 [520C].

[42] Arr. *Anab.* 3.8.4, 11.4.

[43] See, *e.g.*, Arr. *Anab.* 3.23.1-7 (*cf.* Bosworth, *Commentary* [n. 19 above] 348-51).

[44] Arr. *Anab.* 7.23.1.

[45] Strabo 11.13.3 [523C].

[46] Mardoi, Kyrtioi: Strabo 11.13.3. Yamutbal/Emutbala: D. Charpin, '"La toponymie en miroir" dans le Proche-Orient amorrite', *Revue d'Assyriologie* 97 (2003) 3-34, esp. 14-19; A. Porter, 'Beyond dimorphism: ideologies and materialities of kinship', in J. Szuchman (ed.), *Nomads, tribes, and the state in the ancient Near East*, Oriental Institute Seminars 5 (Chicago 2009) 201-25, esp. 203-05; Bāṣerī: Barth, *Nomads* (n. 2 above) 2.

© 2011 Institute of Classical Studies University of London

More interesting, and much more difficult to assess, is the question what kind of status the Tapyroi of ancient Persis enjoyed. The only other Fortification text mentioning the ethnonym, has Tapyroi receiving barley as 'ration-consuming workers' (*kurtaš gal makip*), a very common designation.[47] This may seem to suggest full integration, but the explicit mention of the ethnonym may actually be a sign of bureaucratic recognition of a distinct social and administrative status, setting the Tapyroi apart from other dependent labourers.[48] That the text lists only *puhu* ('boys, girls' or 'servants, subordinates') adds to the group's special character. The text edited above is even more unusual, given the single seal protocol, the title of the allocator, and the bonus rations. Especially the seal protocol deserves emphasis, as it necessarily implies the involvement of an individual with overarching authority. In this respect it reminds us of the case of Karkiš, satrap in Kurmana (Kermān), who sometimes appears in the Fortification archive, seals according to the single seal protocol, commands vast troops, and has, like Gobryas, his own 'workman' (**varda*-).[49] Was the individual who sealed PF-NN 2458, presumably Bakadadda, a high-ranking individual with special authority over the Tapyroi? Was his position comparable to that of Madates, commander of the Ouxioi and described as *regionis praefectus* of the Ouxian country? Is he to be compared with Autophradates, re-installed by Alexander as *satrap* of the Caspian Tapyroi?[50] Whatever the answer may be, an elevated position in the Achaemenid administration would certainly explain the mention of a (court) title in PF-NN 2458.

Regardless of the precise status of the Tapyroi, the texts mentioning them have a direct bearing on the question that started this brief survey: they indicate that the dazzling complexity of the 'Persepolis economy' was, in reality, part of a much wider socio-economic system. At the same time, it is clear that such texts cannot be made to speak unless they are fully integrated into all the available evidence. Unravelling the visible and invisible threads that run through the Fortification archive requires a maximalist approach. Only then can the great promise held out by the Fortification archive be realized: a more complete and more intricate image of the variegated fabric of ancient Persian society.

Vrije Universiteit (Amsterdam) & EPHE (Paris)

[47] PF 0856: "[01] 1050 lts. of barley, [02-03] allocation from Hatarbanuš, [03-04] ration-consuming workers, Tapyroi, [04-05] they received (it) as ration(s). [05-16] First, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh months, in total during 7 months, 24th year. [16] 4 boys (each) 30 (lts.), [17] 1 girl 30 (lts.); [18] total: 5 workers". Hallock, *Fortification texts* (n. 13 above) 680, already tentatively identified the [HAL]*da-pu*[!]*-ra-ip* as Tapyroi.

[48] *Cf.* Henkelman and Stolper, 'Skudrians' (n. 5 above) 271-82.

[49] See Henkelman, 'Consumed' (n. 4) 704-13.

[50] Madates: Curt. 5.3.4; Diod. 17.67.4. *Cf.* P. Briant, 'Contrainte militaire, dépendance rurale et exploitation des territoires en Asie achéménide', *Index* 8 (1978/79) 1-51, esp. 32-33, analysing Madates' function as part of the administrative grid. Comparison with the function of a 'native commissioner' (Atkinson, *Commentary* [n. 19 above] 78-79) seems unhelpful as it overlooks the essential *integration* of the Ouxioi in a wider network. See also B. Jacobs, *Die Satrapienverwaltung im Perserreich zur Zeit Darius' III*, Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients B87 (Wiesbaden 1994) 206. Autophradates: Arr. *Anab.* 3.23.1-7, 24.3, 4.18.2, Curt. 4.12.9, 6.4.24-5; *cf.* Jacobs 73-74, 188-90 (arguing that this satrap's assignment comprised all of Hyrcania) and Th. Petit, *Satrapes et Satrapies dans l'empire achéménide de Cyrus le Grand à Xerxès I*[er] (Paris 1990) 215-16.

© 2011 Institute of Classical Studies University of London